

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/148,234	MOUTSATSOS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ileana Popa	1633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Ileana Popa. (3) Rachael Titlebaum.
 (2) Joseph Woitach. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 April 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ahrens (DNA Cell Biol, 1993, 12: 871-880; Bonadio (U.S. Patent No. 5,763,416; Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,048,964; Wozney (U.S. Patent No. 6,291,206, and Hattersley (U.S. Patent No. 5,700,774).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant was informed that the newly amended claims require new considerations with respect to the prior art. Applicant was also informed that, even if the declaration for unexpected results would be considered, the claimed invention would still not be patentable over the newly identified prior art, which teaches organized bone formation by using mesenchymal cells transfected with a nucleic acid encoding for BMP-2. Upon Applicant's request, the Examiner agreed to reopen prosecution .